On the infinitude of Prime k-tuples

J. LaChapelle

arXiv:1406.6619v1 [math.NT] 25 Jun 2014

Abstract

Starting with Zhang's theorem on the infinitude of prime doubles [1], we give an inductive argument that there exists an infinite number of prime k-tuples for at least one admissible set $\mathcal{H}_k = \{h_1, \ldots, h_k\}$ for each k.

1 Introduction

The eventual lesson learned from counting single primes was "If you want the asymptotics of primes, you have to look at $\zeta(s)|_{\Re(s)=1}$". Indeed, in the single prime case it required a thorough understanding of $\zeta(s)$ to finally nail down the prime number theorem (PNT). Even the Selberg-Erdös 'elementary proof' of the PNT conceals $\zeta(s)$ lurking in the background [2]. Consequently, it seems unlikely that the Hardy-Littlewood k-tuple conjecture [3] can be settled without possessing the k-tuple analog of zeta.

Nevertheless, number theorists have made impressive gains in the quest to count prime k-tuples — especially recently. As important as these recent advances are, the situation for counting prime k-tuples is rather like that for single primes prior to Riemann, Hadamard, and de la Vallée Poussin: Without a k-tuple zeta function to exploit, the focus has been on showing the infinitude of prime k-tuples.

Perhaps the most germane are Zhang's theorem [1] and the Maynard-Tao theorem [4],[5] paraphrased by Granville [6];

Theorem 1.1 *There exists an integer k such that the following is true: If $x+a_1, \ldots, x+a_k$ is an admissible set of forms then there are infinitely many integers n such that at least two of $n+a_1, \ldots, n+a_k$ are prime numbers.*

Theorem 1.2 *For any given integer $m \geq 2$, there exists an integer k such that the following is true: If $x+a_1, \ldots, x+a_k$ is an admissible set of forms then there are infinitely many integers n such that at least m of $n+a_1, \ldots, n+a_k$ are prime numbers.*

Both of these theorems imply a corollary, again given by Granville [6];

Corollary 1.1 *There is an integer h; $0 < h \leq B$ such that there are infinitely many pairs of primes p, $p+h$. (for some finite bound B)*

To justify this corollary, choose a sufficiently large finite interval $(0, B]$ and string it together to cover the positive integers in the obvious way. Each interval contains at least two primes out of a finite number of combinations that could occur. Since there are an infinitude of intervals, at least one of those combinations must be represented an infinite

number of times. Moreover, such a combination is necessarily admissible because h will be even.

Unfortunately, the same reasoning doesn't work for k-tuples with $k > 2$. The problem is, one can deduce an infinite number of at least one particular combination but there is no guarantee it will be an *admissible* k-tuple. This is disappointing because belief in the k-tuple conjecture is strong, so one strongly expects an infinitude of admissible prime k-tuples.

Of course Euclid (and later several others) figured out a way to get the total number of primes without using $\zeta(s)$. And Zhang first did it for (certain) prime doubles. On the other hand, Euler found a way to utilize $\zeta(s)$ to deduce the infinitude of single primes. Can one generalize Euler to the prime double case and thereby get a handle on a k-tuple zeta function? Unfortunately, it is well-known the sum over prime-double reciprocals does not diverge. So a straightforward generalization is thwarted from the start.

But maybe a straightforward generalization is not the best approach. Let's briefly re-interpret Euler's method for guidance. First recall that, if $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of all primes, then

$$\log(\zeta(s)) \asymp \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} p^{-s} \, .$$

We aim to show that $\lim_{s\to 1^+} \log(\zeta(s)) = \infty$, but suppose we do not know Euler's product representation of $\zeta(s)$. We can still conclude the result by a simple argument.

Assume the contrary. Then $\sum \Lambda(n)/\log(n)n^s$ would converge uniformly at $s = 1$, and we would have

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{\log(n)n^s} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n\le N} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{\log(n)n} \, .$$

Hence, partial summation would yield

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} \log(\zeta(s)) = \log(\log(N_{\max})) - \epsilon + O\left(\frac{1}{\log(N_{\max})}\right)$$

where ϵ is an end-point contribution and

$$N_{\max} := \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Lambda(n) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{p^k\le N} \log(p).$$

But from Euclid we know the right-most sum must diverge, and so we have a contradiction. This $\log(\log(N))$ behavior for $\sum_{p\le N} 1/p$ is well-known, and it shows the reciprocal of primes 'just barely' diverges with N.

The point of reviewing Euler's method is to give a preview of our plan for prime doubles. We don't yet have a representation of the prime double zeta function $\zeta_{(2)}(s)$. So we will adapt the above argument to the prime-double case and utilize Zhang's result to infer the divergence of a certain pertinent sum for at least one admissible $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{0, h\}$. It turns out that the pertinent sum to consider is

$$\log'(\zeta_{(2)}(s)) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)}{\log(n)\log(n+h)} \frac{\log(n(n+h)^{1/2})}{(n(n+h))^{s/2}} \asymp \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \frac{\log(p(p+h))}{(p(p+h))^{s/2}} \, .$$

This sum happens to exhibit the $\log(\log(N))$ behavior.

Of course one could just guess this sum. But it is more satisfying and reassuring to see that it comes from the definition

$$\log(\zeta_{(2)}(s)) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)}{\log(n)\log(n+h)} \frac{1}{(n(n+h))^{s/2}} ,$$

which in turn comes from explicit formulae relating exact and average summatory functions for prime doubles [7],[8].

The prime-double case is then extended to k-tuples by induction. The reasoning relies crucially on Zhang's theorem: Given an admissible prime k-tuple $(p+h_1, \ldots, p+h_k)$, Zhang's theorem implies there exists at least one h such that the amended $(k+1)$-tuple $(p+h_1, \ldots, p+h_k, p+h_k+h)$ is also prime (but not necessarily admissible). Of course this is consistent with the Maynard-Tao theorem.

The final step is to show there must be at least one *admissible* prime $(k+1)$-tuple by this construction. Here we rely on a lemma establishing the fortunate circumstance that $\log'(\zeta_{(2)}(s)) \asymp \log'(\zeta_{[2i]}(s))$ where the left side is associated with admissible h and the right side represents an equivalence class of prime doubles $[2i]$ determined by $(2i)^{l'} \sim 2i$ for all $l' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $2i$ such that $(2i)^l = h$ for some $i, l \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

The end game and our main result is the following theorem:

Theorem *Assume $\mathcal{H}_k = \{0, h_2, \ldots, h_k\}$ is admissible. Then*

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} \frac{\sum_{\mathfrak{p}_k \in \mathfrak{P}_k} \frac{\log^{k-1}(p_{(k)})}{p_{(k)}^s}}{(-1)^{k-1}\log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right)} = 1 \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} (-1)^{k-1}\log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right) = \infty \tag{1.2}$$

for at least one admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$.
Here $\mathfrak{P}_k$ is the set of admissible prime k-tuples and $p_{(k)} := (p(p+h_2)\cdots(p+h_k))^{1/k}$.

To briefly recap, possessing exact and average summatory functions for admissible prime k-tuples allows us to infer certain relevant objects $\log(\zeta_{(k)}(s))$. Although $\zeta_{(k)}(s)$ remains elusive, $\log(\zeta_{(k)}(s))$ together with Euler's method and Zhang's theorem allow us to deduce an infinitude of at least one admissible prime k-tuple for all k. History suggests we will need to understand $\zeta_{(k)}(s)$ to go further.

2 Definitions and lemmas

This section will introduce some notation/definitions and establish some useful lemmas.

- $\mathfrak{P}_k$ is the set of admissible prime k-tuples.
- $\mathfrak{P}_k \ni \mathfrak{p}_k := (p, p+h_2, \ldots, p+h_k)$ where p is prime and $\mathcal{H}_k = \{0, h_2, \ldots, h_k\}$ is admissible.

- $n_{(k)} := (n(n+h_2)(n+h_k))^{1/k}$ for integer n.[1]
- $\mu_{(k)}(n) := (-1)^k \mu(n)\cdots\mu(n+h_k)$.
- $\lambda_{(k)}(n) := \Lambda(n)\cdots\Lambda(n+h_k)/\log(n)\cdots\log(n+h_k)$.
- $\Lambda_{(k)}(n) := \lambda_{(k)}(n)\log^k(n_{(k)})$.
- $\log\big(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\big) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{(k)}(n)/n^s_{(k)}\,, \quad \Re(s) > 1$.

Now some lemmas.

Lemma 2.1

$$\log\big(\zeta_{(2)}(s)\big) \asymp \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \frac{1}{p^s_{(2)}} =: \log\big(\mathfrak{z}_{(2)}(s)\big) \ . \tag{2.1}$$

proof: By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\big(\zeta_{(2)}(s)\big) &= \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2^{\boldsymbol{\omega}}\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \frac{1}{\omega p^{\omega s/2}} \frac{1}{\omega'(p^\omega+2i)^{\omega' s/2}}\,, \qquad \Re(s)>1 \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \frac{1}{p^{s/2}} \frac{1}{(p+2i)^{s/2}} + \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \sum_{\omega=2}^{\infty}\sum_{\omega'=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\omega p^{\omega s/2}} \frac{1}{\omega'(p^\omega+2i)^{\omega' s/2}} \\
&=: \log\big(\mathfrak{z}_{(2)}(s)\big) + S(s)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_2^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} := (p^\omega, (p^\omega+2i)^{\omega'})$ is a prime-power double. But, for $s=\sigma+it$ with $\sigma,t\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma>1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|S(s)| &\le \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \sum_{\omega=2}^{\infty}\sum_{\omega'=2}^{\infty} \left| \frac{1}{\omega p^{\omega s/2}} \frac{1}{\omega'(p^\omega+2i)^{\omega' s/2}} \right| \\
&< \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \sum_{\omega=2}^{\infty}\sum_{\omega'=2}^{\infty} \left| \frac{1}{p^{\omega s/2}} \frac{1}{(p^\omega+2i)^{\omega' s/2}} \right| \\
&< \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \sum_{\omega=2}^{\infty}\sum_{\omega'=2}^{\infty} \left| \frac{1}{p^{\omega s/2}} \frac{1}{(p+2i)^{\omega' s/2}} \right| \\
&\le \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2\in\mathfrak{P}_2} \frac{1}{(p^\sigma - p^{\sigma/2})} \frac{1}{((p+2i)^\sigma - (p+2i)^{\sigma/2})} \\
&< \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n^\sigma - n^{\sigma/2})} \frac{1}{((n+2i)^\sigma - (n+2i)^{\sigma/2})} \\
&< \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/2}(n^{1/2}-1)} \frac{1}{(n+2i)^{1/2}((n+2i)^{1/2}-1)} \\
&< \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n-1)^{3/2}} = \zeta(3/2)\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

[1]The subscript (k) is supposed to indicate the level k and implicitly the admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$. Sometimes we will make the dependence on $\mathcal{H}_k$ explicit by writing for example $p_{(h_2)}$ for a particular prime double.

⊟

The following two lemmas utilize a particularly useful interpretation of sums of the form $\sum \mu_{(2)}(n)\Lambda_{(2)}(n)f(n)$. Since the pre-factor localizes onto prime doubles [7], it is advantageous to view the sum as a double sum over the coprime 2-lattice.

Lemma 2.2 *Denote the coprime 2-lattice by* $\{(n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{N}_+^2 \mid \gcd(n_1, n_2) = 1\}$*, and let* $2i \leq 2j = (2i)^l$ *with fixed* $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$*. Then*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{(2i)}(n)\lambda_{(2i)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2i)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2i)) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2j)) - R(2j, 2i; \infty) \tag{2.4}$$

where $R(2j, 2i; \infty) := \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n=N+1-(2j-2i)}^{N} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2j))$.

proof: For $N > 1 + (2j - 2i)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\mu_{(2i)}(n)\lambda_{(2i)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2i)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2i)) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{n_1 \leq N} \sum_{n_2 \leq N+2i} \frac{\mu(n_1)\lambda_{(1)}(n_1)\mu(n_2)\lambda_{(1)}(n_2)}{n_1^{s/2} n_2^{s/2}} \log(n_1 n_2)\, \delta(n_2\,,\, n_1 + 2i) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{n_1=1}^{N} \frac{\mu(n_1)\lambda(n_1)}{n_1^{s/2}} \left(\sum_{n_2 \leq N+2i} \frac{\mu(n_2)\lambda(n_2)}{n_2^{s/2}} \log(n_1 n_2)\, \delta(n_2\,,\, n_1 + 2i) \right) \\
&\qquad \geq \sum_{n_1=1+(2j-2i)}^{N} \frac{\mu(n_1)\lambda(n_1)}{n_1^{s/2}} \left(\sum_{n_2 \leq N+2i} \frac{\mu(n_2)\lambda(n_2)}{n_2^{s/2}} \log(n_1 n_2)\, \delta(n_2\,,\, n_1 + 2i) \right) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{n_1'=1}^{N-(2j-2i)} \frac{\mu(n_1')\lambda(n_1')}{n_1'^{s/2}} \left(\sum_{n_2 \leq N+2i} \frac{\mu(n_2)\lambda(n_2)}{n_2^{s/2}} \log(n_1' n_2)\, \delta(n_2\,,\, n_1' + 2j) \right) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{n=1}^{N-(2j-2i)} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2j))\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

The delta function in the second line restricts the double sum to the appropriate ray $\mathfrak{r}_{(2i)}$ in the coprime 2-lattice. The fourth line is a simple truncation of the outer sum. The fifth line holds since $n_1 \mapsto n_1' = n_1 + 2i - 2j$ bijectively maps lattice intersections of $\mathfrak{r}_{(2i)}$ to lattice intersections of $\mathfrak{r}_{(2j)}$ precisely because $2j = (2i)^l$ which ensures that $\gcd(n_1', n_1' + 2j) = 1$ and the inner sum gets evaluated on a congruent set of coprimes. The result follows as $N \to \infty$ since both series converge for $\Re(s) > 1$. ⊟

By the same token,

Lemma 2.3 *Let* $2j \leq 2m = (2j)^l$ *with fixed* $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$*, then*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{(2m)}(n)\lambda_{(2m)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2m)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2m)) \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2j)) - R(2m, 2j; 1) \tag{2.6}$$

where $R(2m,2j;1) := \sum_{n=1}^{(2m-2j)} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2j))$.

proof: The proof follows the same argument as the preceding lemma.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\mu_{(2m)}(n)\lambda_{(2m)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2m)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2m)) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{n_1'=1+(2m-2j)}^{N+(2m-2j)} \frac{\mu(n_1')\lambda(n_1')}{{n_1'}^{s/2}} \left(\sum_{n_2 \le N+2m} \frac{\mu(n_2)\lambda(n_2)}{n_2^{s/2}} \log(n_1' n_2)\, \delta(n_2\,,\, n_1'+2j) \right) \\
&\qquad \ge \sum_{n_1'=1+(2m-2j)}^{N} \frac{\mu(n_1')\lambda(n_1')}{{n_1'}^{s/2}} \left(\sum_{n_2 \le N+2m} \frac{\mu(n_2)\lambda(n_2)}{n_2^{s/2}} \log(n_1' n_2)\, \delta(n_2\,,\, n_1'+2j) \right) \\
&\qquad = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n(n+2j)) - R(2m,2j;1)\,. \qquad (2.7)
\end{aligned}$$

Again, the crucial fact is that $\gcd(n_1, n_1+2m) = 1$ and the map $n_1 \mapsto n_1' = n_1+2m-2j$ ensures that $\gcd(n_1', n_1'+2j) = 1$. $\boxminus$

Therefore choosing $2i \le 2j = (2i)^l$ or $(2j)^l = 2i \ge 2j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log'\left(\mathfrak{z}_{(2i)}(s)\right) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{(2i)}(n)\lambda_{(2i)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2i)^{s/2}} \log(n_{(2i)}) \\
&\ge \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{(2j)}(n)\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{n^{s/2}(n+2j)^{s/2}} \log(n_{(2j)}) \pm |2j-2i| \\
&= \log'\left(\mathfrak{z}_{(2j)}(s)\right) \pm |2j-2i| \qquad (2.8)
\end{aligned}$$

follows from Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 because the remainder in both cases is certainly bounded by $|2j-2i|$. So if $2i$ is square-free and $2j = (2i)^l$, then

$$\log'\left(\mathfrak{z}_{[2i]}(s)\right) \asymp \log'\left(\mathfrak{z}_{(2j)}(s)\right), \quad \Re(s) > 1 \qquad (2.9)$$

where the equivalence class includes all integer powers of $2i$.

Together with Lemma 2.1 conclude

Corollary 2.1

$$\log'\left(\zeta_{[2i])}(s)\right) \asymp \log'\left(\zeta_{(2j)}(s)\right), \quad \Re(s) > 1\,. \qquad (2.10)$$

3 Euler's lead

With these preliminaries, we can follow Euler's method for prime doubles. Recall the definition

Definition 3.1

$$\log\left(\zeta_{(2)}(s)\right) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{(2)}(n)}{n_{(2)}^{s}}, \quad \Re(s) > 1\,. \qquad (3.1)$$

We have

Proposition 3.1 *Let $2j = h$ where h comes from Zhang's theorem. Then*

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} \log'\left(\zeta_{(2j)}(s)\right) = \infty\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof: Assume the contrary. Then $\lim_{s\to 1^+} \log'\left(\zeta_{2j}(s)\right)$ is bounded and so converges. Consequently, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an M such that $m > M$ implies

$$\left| \sum_{n=m+1}^{m+l} \frac{\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{(n+2j)} \log(n_{(2j)}) \right| < \varepsilon \tag{3.3}$$

for each $l \in \mathbb{N}_+$. It follows that $\log'\left(\zeta_{2j}(s)\right)$ converges uniformly for $\Re(s) \geq 1$.

Now, the PNT implies $\lambda_{(1)}(n+2j) = \lambda(n+2j) = O(1/\log(n+2j))$. Moreover, $\log(n_{(2)})/\log(n) = O(1)$. So by uniform convergence, the PNT, and partial summation we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{s\to 1^+} \log'\left(\zeta_{(2j)}(s)\right) &> -\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{\lambda_{(2j)}(n)}{(n+2j)} \log(n_{(2j)}) \\
&\sim -\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{w_{(2j)}(n)\Lambda(n)}{(n+2j)\log(n+2j)} \\
&= \log(\log(N^{(j)}_{\max})) - \epsilon_{2j} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log(N^{(j)}_{\max})}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where the weight $w_{(2j)}(n) = 1$ if $\Lambda(n) \neq 0 \wedge \Lambda(n+2j) \neq 0$ and $w_{(2j)}(n) = 0$ otherwise, $N^{(j)}_{\max} := \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N} w_{(2j)}(n)\Lambda(n)$, and the constant ϵ_{2j} is an inconsequential end-point contribution. But the PNT and Zhang's theorem imply $N^{(j)}_{\max} = \infty$, and we arrive at a contradiction. $\square$

Therefore, for at least one $2j$, Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 2.1 imply

Corollary 3.1

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} \log'\left(\mathfrak{z}_{[2i]}(s)\right) = \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_2 \in \mathfrak{P}_2} \frac{\log(p_{[2i]})}{p_{[2i]}} = \infty \tag{3.5}$$

where $[2i]$ is the equivalence class determined by $(2i)^{l'} \sim 2i$ for all $l' \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $2i$ such that $(2i)^l = 2j$ for some $i, l \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

The sum must include an infinite number of terms, and so there are infinitely many $\mathfrak{p}_2 \in \mathfrak{P}_2$ for each admissible $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{0, [2i]\}$.

4 Proof of Theorem

We restate the theorem for easy reference.

Theorem 4.1 *Assume $\mathcal{H}_k$ is admissible. Then*

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} \frac{\sum_{\mathfrak{p}_k\in\mathfrak{P}_k} \frac{\log^{k-1}(p_{(k)})}{p_{(k)}^s}}{(-1)^{k-1}\log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right)} = 1 \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} (-1)^{k-1}\log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right) = \infty \tag{4.2}$$

for at least one admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$.

Proof: It is straightforward to show that (2.1) generalizes to $\log\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right) \asymp \sum_{\mathfrak{p}_k\in\mathfrak{P}_k} p_{(k)}^{-s}$ with $|S(s)| < \zeta(\frac{k+1}{k})$. So

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{p}_k\in\mathfrak{P}_k} \frac{\log^{k-1}(p_{(k)})}{p_{(k)}^s} \asymp (-1)^{k-1}\log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right) \ . \tag{4.3}$$

Now let $w_{(k+1)}(n) = 1$ encode the condition that $\Lambda_{(k)}(n) \neq 0 \wedge \Lambda(n+h_{k+1}) \neq 0$ and $w_{(k+1)}(n) = 0$ otherwise. Evidently $w_{(k+1)}(n) = w_{(k)}(n)w_{(1)}(n+h_{k+1})$. In particular

$$w_{(k+1)}(n)\Lambda(n+h_{k+1}) = w_{(k)}(n)\Lambda(n+h_{k+1}) \ . \tag{4.4}$$

Also note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right) &= (-1)^{k-1}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{(k)}(n)}{n_{(k)}^s}\log^{k-1}(n_{(k)}) \\
&> (-1)^{k-1}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{(k)}(n)}{(n+h_k)^s}\log^{k-1}(n_{(k)}) \\
&= (-1)^{k-1}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{w_{(k)}(n)\lambda_{(k)}(n)}{\log^{1-k}(n_{(k)})}\frac{1}{(n+h_k)^s} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

So assuming $w_{(k)}(n)\lambda_{(k)}(n) = O(\lambda(n+h_k)\log^{1-k}(n_{(k)}))$ with $\mathcal{H}_k$ admissible is tantamount to assuming (4.2) which in turn implies infinitely many $\mathfrak{p}_k \in \mathfrak{P}_k$.

Consequently, adopting the assumption that $w_{(k)}(n)\lambda_{(k)}(n) = O(\lambda(n+h_k)\log^{1-k}(n_{(k)}))$ for at least one admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$ — which is tautological for $k = 1$, get

$$\begin{aligned}(-1)^k \log^{(k)'}\left(\zeta_{(k+1)}(s)\right) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{(k+1)}(n)}{n^s_{(k+1)}} \log^k(n_{(k+1)}) \\ &> \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{(k+1)}(n)}{(n+h_{k+1})^s} \log^k(n_{(k+1)}) \\ &> \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{(k+1)}(n)}{(n+h_{k+1})^s} \left(\frac{k}{k+1}\right)^k \log^k(n_{(k)}) \\ &\sim \left(\frac{k}{k+1}\right)^k \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{w_{(2)}(n+h_k)\Lambda(n+h_k)}{\log(n+h_{k+1})(n+h_{k+1})^s}\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where the binomial expansion was used in the third line (keeping only the first term), and the last line uses the assumption as well as $\lambda(n+h_{k+1}) = O(1/\log(n+h_{k+1}))$ implied by the PNT and $\log(n_{(k)})/\log(n+h_k) = O(1)$.

As in the prime double case, assume $(-1)^k \log^{(k)'}\left(\zeta_{(k+1)}(s)\right)$ is bounded at $s = 1$. Partial summation yields

$$\lim_{s\to 1^+} (-1)^k \log^{(k)'}\left(\zeta_{(k+1)}(s)\right) \sim \log(\log(\max x)) - \epsilon_{h_{k+1}} \ . \tag{4.7}$$

But again we have a contradiction, because $\max x = \lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n=1+h_k}^{N+h_k} w_{(2)}(n)\Lambda(n) = \infty$ follows from Zhang's work for at least one $2j_{k+1}$ with $0 < 2j_{k+1} \leq h_{k+1} - h_k$ provided $h_{k+1} - h_k$ is chosen large enough. Hence, $\lim_{s\to 1^+}(-1)^k \log^{(k)'}\left(\zeta_{(k+1)}(s)\right) = \infty$ for the associated equivalence class $[2i_{k+1}]$ by previous arguments.

If it happens that $2i_{k+1} \equiv 0 \pmod{k+1}$, then $h_k + [2i_{k+1}]$ and h_k belong to the same residue class (mod $k+1$) so $\mathcal{H}_{k+1} = \{0, \ldots, h_k, h_k + [2i_{k+1}]\}$ is automatically admissible. Conversely, if $2i_{k+1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k+1}$, then $\mathcal{H}_{k+1}$ can be rendered admissible for a suitable choice of representative in $[2i_{k+1}]$. For example, if $2i_{k+1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{k+1}$, then $h_{k+1} = h_k + (2i_{k+1})$ and $h_{k+1} = h_k + (2i_{k+1})^2$ belong to different residue classes (mod $k+1$). Consequently at least one of them will yield an admissible $\mathcal{H}_{k+1}$, because at least one case will not occupy the complete set of residue classes modulo primes.

Finally, Zhang's result guarantees the induction assumption is true at $k = 2$ for at least one $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{0, 2j_2\}$. It follows that $\lim_{s\to 1^+}(-1)^k \log^{(k-1)'}\left(\zeta_{(k)}(s)\right) = \infty$ for at least one admissible $\mathcal{H}_k = \{0, [2i_2], [2i_2] + [2i_3], \ldots, \sum_{\hat{k}\leq k}[2i_{\hat{k}}]\}$ for all k by induction. □

Corollary 4.1 *Given an admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$ satisfying Theorem 4.1, if some $2j_{\hat{k}} = 2^a$ for integer a, then there are infinitely many twin primes.*

Proof: The $(0, \ldots, \hat{k}, \ldots)$ components of $\mathfrak{p}_k$ determine an admissible $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{0, 2^a\}$ and its associated prime doubles $\mathfrak{p}_2$ of which there are necessarily infinitely many. Then previous arguments imply the claim. Of course similar statements for other types of

prime doubles can be made for any component of $\mathfrak{p}_k$ with $2j_{\hat{k}} = (2i_{\hat{k}})^a$. $\square$

One would like to extend this theorem to *all* admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$. But such an extension would require that $\max x \to \infty$ for *all* prime doubles. In this case, the assumption used for the induction argument could be made for all admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$ and verified at $k = 2$.

Corollary 4.2 *If $\zeta_{(2)}(s)$ is meromorphic on $\mathbb{C}$ with a single simple pole at $s = 1$, then Theorem 4.1 holds for all admissible $\mathcal{H}_k$.*

5 Acknowledgments

I thank A. Granville for offering some helpful advice.

References

[1] Yitang Zhang, Bounded gaps between primes, *Ann. Math.*, **179**(3), (2014), 1121–1174.

[2] D. Harvey, Selberg's Symmetyry Formula, *Expo. Math.*, **22**, (2004), 185-195.

[3] G.H Hardy and J.E. Littlewood, Some problems of 'Partitio numerorum'; III: On the expression of a number as a sum of primes, *Acta Math.*, **44**(1), (1923), 1–70.

[4] J. Maynard, Small Gaps Between Primes, arXiv:math.NT/1311.4600v2 (2013).

[5] T. Tao, Polymath8b: Bounded intervals with many primes, after Maynard, http://terrytao.wordpress.com/2013/11/19/polymath8b-bounded-intervals-with-many-primes-after-m

[6] A. Granville, Primes in Intervals of Bounded Length, www.dms.umontreal.ca/ andrew/CEBBrochureFinal.pdf

[7] J. LaChapelle, Exact Summatory Functions for Prime k-tuples, arXiv:math.NT/1406.5533 (2014).

[8] J. LaChapelle, A Gamma Distribution Hypothesis for Prime k-tuples, arXiv:math.NT/1406.6289 (2014).